Forensic Anthropology in Criminal Justice: Evidentiary Reliability, Human Identification, and Procedural Integrity

Sergio Pommier Gallo, PhD
Stanford University
ORCID: 0009-0000-7387-3943
Web of Science ResearcherID: QDO-1840-2026

Abstract

Forensic anthropology occupies a distinctive position at the intersection of criminology, forensic science, criminal investigation, and criminal procedure because it converts biological information contained in human skeletal remains into evidence capable of assisting legal institutions. Its contribution, however, is not exhausted by the technical examination of bones. The legal significance of forensic anthropology depends upon the reliability of its methods, the limits of expert inference, the integrity of recovery and documentation procedures, and the capacity of courts and investigators to distinguish scientific findings from conclusions that exceed the underlying evidence. This article examines forensic anthropology as an evidentiary and procedural discipline within contemporary criminal justice. It conducts a qualitative doctrinal and interdisciplinary analysis of international forensic standards, professional guidance, and legal principles governing expert evidence. Particular attention is given to human identification, medicolegal significance, disaster victim identification, fragmented and commingled remains, methodological validation, error, documentation, and judicial assessment of expert testimony. The analysis demonstrates that the principal legal challenge is not whether forensic anthropology can contribute to criminal investigations, but how its contribution should be translated into legally reliable evidence without allowing scientific authority to substitute for methodological demonstration. The article argues that procedural integrity must begin at recovery, continue through examination and documentation, and culminate in transparent communication of findings and limitations to investigators, prosecutors, defense counsel, and courts. Forensic anthropology should therefore be understood not merely as a technique for identifying human remains, but as a controlled evidentiary process in which scientific reliability, chain-of-custody integrity, expert competence, and proportionality of inference are mutually dependent.

Keywords

forensic anthropology; criminal justice; human identification; forensic evidence; skeletal remains; expert testimony; evidentiary reliability; disaster victim identification; criminal procedure; forensic science

Introduction

Forensic anthropology has become an important component of contemporary forensic investigation because skeletal remains may preserve information that remains unavailable when ordinary forms of identification are impossible. The discipline can contribute to the examination of unidentified remains, the assessment of biological characteristics, the interpretation of skeletal trauma, the recovery and triage of remains, and the reconciliation of postmortem information within broader identification processes. Its practical importance is particularly visible in mass-fatality incidents, clandestine burials, fragmented remains, and circumstances in which decomposition or environmental conditions substantially reduce the evidentiary value of soft tissue.

The expansion of forensic anthropology creates a corresponding legal problem. Scientific information does not become legally reliable merely because it originates from a specialized discipline. Courts must determine whether the underlying methodology is sufficiently reliable, whether it has been properly applied, whether the expert has stayed within the limits of the evidence, and whether the resulting opinion is relevant to the legal question presented. In the United States, the Supreme Court's decision in Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals established a flexible judicial inquiry into scientific validity, including considerations such as testability, peer review, potential error rates, standards controlling operation, and relevant scientific acceptance. The decision also emphasized that judicial scrutiny concerns principles and methodology rather than the mere authority of an expert. (Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, 1993).

The problem is broader than admissibility. In criminal investigations, the integrity of forensic anthropology may be compromised before an expert ever writes a report. Recovery practices, numbering, scene documentation, separation of remains, packaging, transportation, contamination control, and the preservation of contextual information all influence the quality of subsequent analysis. INTERPOL's Disaster Victim Identification framework, for example, treats scene examination, postmortem data, antemortem data, and

reconciliation as interconnected phases rather than isolated technical activities. INTERPOL also emphasizes that remains should be separately documented and numbered and that re-association should be performed by appropriately authorized forensic experts. (INTERPOL, 2023).

The scientific and legal dimensions are therefore inseparable. An analytically sophisticated examination cannot fully repair a compromised recovery record. Conversely, meticulous recovery and documentation cannot compensate for an unreliable analytical method or an expert conclusion that exceeds the available evidence. The evidentiary value of forensic anthropology is consequently cumulative: it depends upon the integrity of the entire pathway by which a biological observation becomes a legal proposition.

This article examines that pathway. Rather than proposing a new theory of forensic anthropology, it evaluates the discipline through established principles of forensic reliability, criminal procedure, expert evidence, and international identification practice. The objective is to clarify how forensic anthropology can contribute to criminal justice while preserving scientific restraint, procedural fairness, and institutional accountability.

Research Question

The central research question is: How should forensic anthropology be integrated into criminal justice so that anthropological findings concerning human remains retain scientific reliability and procedural integrity when translated into criminal evidence?

Three subsidiary questions follow. First, what methodological and procedural conditions are necessary for anthropological findings to possess meaningful evidentiary value? Second, how should investigators and courts distinguish observations, analytical inferences, and ultimate legal conclusions? Third, what safeguards are necessary when fragmented, burned, commingled, or otherwise compromised remains create elevated risks of error and overinterpretation?

Hypothesis

The hypothesis is that the evidentiary reliability of forensic anthropology depends less upon the existence of specialized expertise alone than upon the integrity of the complete forensic process: controlled recovery, secure identification and numbering, validated analytical methods, transparent documentation, appropriate quality assurance, and disciplined communication of uncertainty. Where any of these components is materially deficient, the

probative value of anthropological conclusions may be reduced even when the individual expert possesses substantial credentials.

A secondary hypothesis follows: courts and criminal justice institutions are better protected against forensic overstatement when anthropological testimony is expressed in terms proportionate to the empirical foundation of the examination, rather than through categorical conclusions unsupported by validated methodology or corroborating identification evidence.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework is interdisciplinary but conservative. It combines three established perspectives: forensic science as evidence production, criminal procedure as a system of institutional safeguards, and criminology as the study of crime, investigation, victimization, and social responses to offending.

First, forensic science converts observations about physical traces into propositions relevant to an investigation or adjudication. The transition from observation to proposition introduces inferential steps. A skeletal observation is not identical to an identification; a biological profile is not identical to a person's legal identity; and the observation of trauma is not necessarily proof of the mechanism, intent, or legal classification of death. Maintaining these distinctions is fundamental to evidentiary reasoning.

Second, criminal procedure imposes institutional requirements on evidence. Evidence must be capable of being challenged, documented, contextualized, and evaluated by parties with potentially conflicting interests. Expert evidence is therefore not self-authenticating. Its credibility depends upon methodological transparency and the ability of other participants in the justice system to examine the basis and limits of the expert conclusion.

Third, forensic anthropology is connected to criminology because unidentified and recovered human remains arise within broader phenomena of homicide, organized crime, armed conflict, disasters, migration, missing persons, and other forms of victimization. The discipline can therefore contribute to the reconstruction of criminal events while remaining distinct from the criminological explanation of offending behavior.

Within this framework, scientific reliability is treated as a process rather than a credential. The expert's education and experience matter, but they do not eliminate the need to demonstrate methodological validity and appropriate application. Daubert illustrates this

principle by requiring judicial attention to the reliability and relevance of expert methodology. Later developments in forensic science have reinforced the importance of standards, validation, error assessment, quality assurance, and transparent reporting. Professional standards provide a complementary institutional structure. The American Academy of Forensic Sciences' Standards Board has published best-practice recommendations addressing forensic anthropology in disaster victim identification, including preparedness, search and recovery, triage, postmortem anthropology, and reconciliation. NIST's OSAC standards library likewise records standards and proposed standards addressing skeletal preparation, sampling, and medicolegal significance. These materials illustrate the movement toward standardized forensic practice rather than purely individualized expert judgment.

Methodology

This study employs qualitative doctrinal legal research combined with comparative forensic analysis and interdisciplinary criminological analysis. The doctrinal component examines principles governing expert evidence, scientific reliability, relevance, procedural integrity, and the institutional treatment of forensic findings. The comparative component considers international forensic standards and professional frameworks, particularly INTERPOL DVI guidance and standards associated with forensic anthropology in the United States. The criminological component situates forensic anthropology within investigation, victim identification, homicide investigation, missing-person processes, and mass-fatality management.

The analysis is normative rather than empirical. It does not claim to calculate an error rate for forensic anthropology as a whole and does not generalize from individual cases to all practitioners or jurisdictions. Instead, it evaluates the conditions under which anthropological evidence can be responsibly integrated into criminal justice.

Primary and institutional materials include judicial authority concerning expert evidence, INTERPOL's DVI materials, American Academy of Forensic Sciences Standards Board recommendations, and NIST's forensic science standards resources. These are supplemented by peer-reviewed scientific literature addressing evidentiary standards and forensic anthropology. The methodological objective is to distinguish established procedural safeguards from areas where further validation, standardization, or jurisdiction-

specific regulation may be necessary.

A central methodological precaution is the separation of three levels of proposition: observation, inference, and legal conclusion. For example, an anthropologist may observe a skeletal feature, infer a biological characteristic from a validated method, and provide an expert opinion concerning its consistency with an identification proposition. The final legal determination of identity, criminal responsibility, homicide, intent, or guilt remains an institutional decision rather than a scientific conclusion. This distinction prevents forensic expertise from becoming a substitute for adjudication.

Results and Legal Analysis

1. Forensic anthropology as a controlled evidentiary process

Forensic anthropology should be understood as a chain of scientific operations rather than a single examination. The first legally significant operation may occur at the scene. INTERPOL guidance requires systematic recovery and documentation, including unique numbering, photographic documentation, recovery records, and secure transport. The purpose is not merely administrative. Documentation establishes the identity and provenance of the material later examined. If that connection is weakened, subsequent findings may become difficult to interpret.

The distinction between recovery and re-association is especially important in cases involving fragmented remains. INTERPOL guidance emphasizes that separate remains should not simply be matched or placed together on the basis of external appearance and that re-association should be conducted by authorized forensic experts. Fragmentation, commingling, and contamination create a particular risk because an apparently coherent evidentiary narrative may be constructed from materials that actually originate from different individuals. The forensic response must therefore preserve uncertainty rather than prematurely eliminate it.

The American Academy of Forensic Sciences' best-practice recommendation similarly recognizes multiple roles for forensic anthropology in disaster victim identification, from preparedness and recovery through triage, postmortem data collection, and reconciliation. This institutional architecture demonstrates that anthropology is not confined to a laboratory stage. Its reliability is distributed across the forensic workflow.

2. Human identification and the limits of anthropological inference

Human identification is among the most consequential functions of forensic investigation because an erroneous identification affects not only a deceased person but also families, investigative priorities, legal records, and potentially criminal prosecutions. INTERPOL identifies fingerprints, dental records, and DNA as principal means capable of providing conclusive identification in disaster victim identification contexts, while anthropological examination contributes important postmortem information and assists the broader reconciliation process.

This distinction has legal importance. Anthropological assessment may establish or estimate characteristics that narrow an identification field, but narrowing a field is not necessarily equivalent to establishing identity. Courts should therefore distinguish between an anthropological profile and a positive identification based upon a primary identifier. The evidentiary weight of anthropological information depends upon the method used, the quality of the remains, the reference population where relevant, and the degree to which independent evidence corroborates the conclusion.

This does not diminish forensic anthropology. On the contrary, it clarifies its legitimate evidentiary role. A scientifically bounded conclusion can be more useful than an overconfident categorical opinion because it allows investigators and courts to integrate anthropological findings with dental, genetic, medical, contextual, and documentary evidence.

3. Fragmented and commingled remains

Fragmented remains generate distinctive procedural risks. INTERPOL guidance addresses large-scale disasters involving mutilated bodies and emphasizes separate numbering, contamination controls, and the need to avoid treating an isolated fragment as representative of an entire individual. It also recognizes the possibility of human and animal material being mixed and assigns exclusion and pre-sorting responsibilities to appropriately trained forensic specialists.

The legal consequence is that chain of custody must be understood together with chain of interpretation. Traditional chain-of-custody analysis asks whether the physical evidence presented in court is the same evidence recovered from the relevant scene. Forensic anthropology requires an additional question: whether the analytical identity assigned to that material remained stable throughout the examination. A bone fragment that changes

evidentiary category, number, presumed association, or individual attribution without adequate documentation may create an interpretive chain break even when the physical object itself was continuously stored.

The distinction is especially important in mass-fatality contexts. Multiple victims may present similar biological characteristics, and visual similarity cannot substitute for documented reconciliation. INTERPOL's insistence upon separate numbering and controlled re-association reflects an evidentiary principle with broad application: uncertainty must be managed before it becomes embedded in the forensic record.

4. Scientific reliability and judicial gatekeeping

The judicial assessment of expert evidence requires attention to methodology. Daubert identifies testability, peer review and publication, potential error rates, standards controlling operation, and scientific acceptance as relevant considerations, while stressing that the inquiry is flexible and focused on scientific validity and relevance.

Forensic anthropology therefore cannot rely exclusively on professional status or the language of expertise. The court must be able to understand what was examined, how it was examined, which method was employed, what assumptions underlie the method, what limitations affected the examination, and whether the conclusion fits the factual circumstances.

The existence of professional standards is relevant to this assessment. NIST's OSAC registry records an ANSI/ASB standard addressing the determination of medicolegal significance from skeletal remains and a proposed standard concerning skeletal preparation and sampling. Such standards demonstrate the institutional development of controlled practice. At the same time, the status of a particular standard must be accurately described; a published standard, a proposed standard, and a standard formally accepted into a particular registry are not interchangeable categories. Precision about the status of standards is itself part of responsible forensic testimony.

The same principle applies to error. The absence of a universally applicable single error rate does not justify treating a method as inherently unreliable, but neither should it justify categorical certainty. Reliability is method-specific and context-specific. Courts should therefore require experts to articulate the limitations that arise from the condition of the remains, the reference data, the method employed, and the inferential distance between

observation and conclusion.

5. Expert competence and institutional accountability

Expert competence has at least three dimensions: technical competence, methodological competence, and evidentiary competence. Technical competence concerns the ability to perform the relevant anthropological examination. Methodological competence concerns knowledge of validation, limitations, quality assurance, and appropriate application. Evidentiary competence concerns the ability to communicate findings without exceeding the scientific basis of the examination.

This third dimension is particularly significant in criminal proceedings. An expert report can be scientifically accurate at the observational level while becoming misleading through the wording of its conclusion. The distinction between “consistent with,” “supports,” “strongly supports,” and “identifies as” can materially affect how a judge, prosecutor, investigator, or jury understands the evidence. Consequently, reporting language is not merely editorial. It is part of evidentiary reliability.

The U.S. Department of Justice has developed Uniform Language for Testimony and Reports for forensic disciplines, including anthropology, as guidance for scientific statements in reports and testimony. The existence of such guidance illustrates the institutional recognition that forensic conclusions should be expressed consistently and within disciplined boundaries.

6. Procedural integrity and defense rights

Forensic evidence acquires legal significance within an adversarial or otherwise contestable procedure. Defense counsel must be able to examine the basis of an anthropological conclusion, challenge methodological assumptions, request appropriate disclosure, and present contrary expert evidence where legally permitted. A forensic discipline may be highly specialized, but specialization cannot create an evidentiary domain immune from procedural scrutiny.

This is particularly important where the forensic conclusion becomes central to identity or criminal attribution. If an anthropological opinion is used to establish the identity of remains and that identity becomes foundational to a homicide prosecution, any weakness in the original anthropological inference may propagate throughout the case. Procedural safeguards should therefore address the evidentiary dependency between forensic findings.

The same principle applies to disclosure. Relevant photographs, recovery documentation, examination notes, measurements, laboratory records, methodological references, quality-control records, and material limitations may be necessary for meaningful scrutiny. Transparency does not require that every scientific process be reduced to a lay explanation, but it does require sufficient disclosure for qualified participants to evaluate the reasoning.

7. Disaster victim identification and the international dimension

Forensic anthropology is especially valuable in international and transnational settings. INTERPOL's DVI framework provides a coordinated model involving scene examination, postmortem data, antemortem data, and reconciliation. Its international character is significant because mass-fatality events frequently involve victims from multiple jurisdictions.

The international dimension also creates legal complications. Identification may involve records held in different states, cross-border family information, different evidentiary rules, differing forensic capacities, and varying standards for expert evidence. A scientifically coherent identification process can therefore encounter procedural discontinuity when evidence moves across jurisdictions.

International standardization can reduce this discontinuity. INTERPOL's DVI Guide is described by the organization as the globally accepted standard for DVI protocols, and the organization maintains specialized guidance on anthropology, quality management, fragmentary remains, and family communication. Such instruments do not replace national criminal procedure, but they can provide a common forensic language for international cooperation.

8. From scientific finding to criminal attribution

One of the most important limitations of forensic anthropology is the boundary between biological evidence and criminal attribution. An anthropological examination may identify remains, document skeletal trauma, estimate biological characteristics, or contribute to reconstruction. It does not, by itself, establish who caused an injury, what the perpetrator intended, whether a legally defined homicide occurred, or whether a particular suspect is criminally responsible.

Maintaining this boundary is essential to avoid forensic overreach. The legal system must integrate multiple categories of evidence: witness testimony, digital evidence, DNA,

fingerprints, pathology, toxicology, documentary evidence, scene reconstruction, and other relevant material. Anthropology may provide a critical component without becoming the entire evidentiary explanation.

This is consistent with the broader logic of expert evidence. Scientific testimony should assist the fact-finder rather than determine the legal conclusion. The expert explains the significance and limitations of specialized information; the court determines the legal consequences.

9. Ethical treatment of human remains

The evidentiary treatment of human remains also has an ethical dimension. Human skeletal remains are not merely laboratory objects. They are the physical remains of individuals whose families may seek identification, information, and dignified treatment.

NIST has recently documented work toward standards concerning the ethical use of contemporary human skeletal remains in education, training, and research in forensic anthropology. The development of such standards reflects an expanding understanding that forensic quality includes ethical governance.

Ethical treatment is also relevant to evidentiary integrity. Respectful handling, accurate documentation, secure storage, controlled access, and appropriate communication with families can coexist with rigorous investigative requirements. Indeed, these objectives frequently reinforce one another because careful stewardship reduces the risk of loss, contamination, misidentification, and undocumented alteration.

10. The forensic anthropology–criminology interface

The contribution of forensic anthropology to criminology is broader than identification. Human remains can provide information relevant to patterns of victimization, homicide investigation, missing-person systems, mass violence, organized crime, and the spatial and temporal characteristics of offending. In clandestine burial investigations, for example, the location and condition of remains may become part of a larger reconstruction of criminal conduct.

Nevertheless, criminological interpretation must remain analytically distinct from anthropological observation. The discipline can contribute data to criminological analysis without converting every biological observation into a behavioral theory. This separation protects both fields. Anthropology retains methodological discipline, while criminology

gains reliable forensic information that can be situated within broader explanations of crime.

11. Toward an integrated evidentiary model

The analysis supports an integrated model based on five mutually dependent conditions: provenance, methodological validity, analytical transparency, corroboration, and procedural contestability.

Provenance concerns the secure connection between the recovered material and the documented scene. Methodological validity concerns whether the analytical method is sufficiently supported and appropriately applied. Analytical transparency concerns the disclosure of observations, assumptions, methods, limitations, and reasoning. Corroboration concerns the integration of anthropological findings with independent evidence where identification or attribution requires more than anthropology alone. Procedural contestability concerns the ability of the parties and the court to examine and challenge the evidence.

None of these conditions should be treated as a substitute for the others. A scientifically valid method applied to incorrectly associated remains remains problematic. Perfect recovery documentation cannot validate an untested analytical method. A strong anthropological finding may still be insufficient to establish identity if the legal question requires corroboration. And evidence that cannot be meaningfully disclosed or challenged may raise procedural concerns even if technically accurate.

The integrated model therefore shifts attention from the prestige of forensic expertise to the architecture of reliability. This approach is compatible with existing legal and forensic frameworks and does not require the creation of a new autonomous theory of forensic anthropology.

Discussion

The principal implication of this analysis is that forensic anthropology should be evaluated as an evidentiary system whose reliability emerges from cumulative procedural controls. The discipline's legal value is strongest when the transition from physical remains to forensic conclusion is documented at every material stage.

This perspective also explains why forensic anthropology should not be reduced to the question of whether an anthropologist is qualified. Qualification is necessary but

insufficient. Modern forensic practice requires attention to standards, validation, documentation, quality assurance, uncertainty, and communication. The development of professional standards by forensic institutions reflects this evolution.

The second implication concerns judicial reasoning. Courts should resist two opposite errors. The first is excessive deference to scientific authority, under which expert credentials effectively replace methodological scrutiny. The second is excessive skepticism toward forensic disciplines merely because their methods involve probabilistic or inferential reasoning. The appropriate approach is methodological evaluation. Courts should ask whether the method is appropriate to the question, whether it has been properly applied, whether relevant limitations have been disclosed, and whether the conclusion exceeds the evidentiary foundation.

The third implication concerns the relationship between anthropology and primary identifiers. In many identification contexts, DNA, fingerprints, and dental evidence may provide more direct identification than anthropological assessment. This does not make anthropology secondary in a simplistic sense. Anthropologists may be essential to recovery, triage, skeletal analysis, trauma assessment, biological profiling, and the organization of fragmentary remains. Their contribution is often what makes subsequent identification processes possible.

The fourth implication concerns international criminal justice. Standardized forensic procedures can facilitate cooperation across jurisdictions, particularly in mass-fatality incidents and cases involving missing persons. INTERPOL's framework demonstrates the practical value of common procedures. Yet harmonization should not be confused with uniformity of national evidentiary law. International forensic standards can improve scientific compatibility while leaving admissibility and procedural consequences to domestic legal systems.

Finally, the analysis indicates that forensic anthropology should be integrated into criminal justice through disciplined modesty. The strongest expert is not necessarily the one who offers the most categorical conclusion, but the one who can precisely identify what the evidence establishes, what it supports, what it cannot establish, and what additional evidence would be required to resolve remaining uncertainty. In criminal justice, this distinction is not a weakness of science. It is one of the conditions of scientific credibility.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, it is doctrinal and normative rather than empirical and therefore does not estimate the prevalence of forensic error across jurisdictions or laboratories. Second, the legal analysis relies substantially on U.S. expert-evidence doctrine as an illustrative framework, particularly Daubert, while recognizing that admissibility standards vary internationally. Third, professional and institutional standards develop over time, and their legal status differs according to the issuing organization and jurisdiction. The analysis therefore distinguishes between binding legal rules, professional standards, best-practice recommendations, and proposed standards rather than treating them as equivalent. Fourth, the paper does not attempt to evaluate every anthropological identification method or every national system of forensic regulation. Its purpose is to establish an evidentiary and procedural framework that can accommodate method-specific analysis.

Conclusions

Forensic anthropology occupies a significant but carefully bounded position within contemporary criminal justice. Its contribution to human identification, recovery, skeletal analysis, trauma assessment, and disaster victim identification can be indispensable, particularly when conventional identification processes are impaired by decomposition, fragmentation, fire, mass casualty, or other conditions.

The legal value of that contribution, however, depends upon procedural integrity. The evidentiary pathway begins with recovery and documentation and continues through numbering, preservation, examination, methodological application, quality assurance, reporting, disclosure, expert testimony, and judicial evaluation. A failure at any material stage may affect the reliability of the final conclusion.

The analysis supports five principles. First, forensic anthropology should be treated as a controlled evidentiary process rather than a credential-based source of authority. Second, anthropological findings must remain proportionate to the scientific foundation of the method and the condition of the remains. Third, identification should be distinguished from biological profiling, reconstruction, and legal attribution, with independent evidence integrated where necessary. Fourth, international standards and professional guidance can strengthen consistency without replacing domestic procedural law. Fifth, transparency

concerning uncertainty and limitations is an essential component of forensic reliability rather than an admission of scientific weakness.

The resulting approach does not require a new theory of forensic anthropology. It requires disciplined application of established principles of scientific validity, procedural fairness, expert accountability, and forensic quality assurance. Within criminology and criminal justice, this approach allows forensic anthropology to expand its contribution while preserving the boundary between scientific evidence and legal judgment.

Forensic anthropology is therefore most valuable when its scientific authority remains accountable to methodological evidence and procedural scrutiny. Its role is neither merely descriptive nor determinative. Properly integrated, it is an evidentiary discipline that helps criminal justice institutions establish facts while preserving the institutional responsibility to decide what those facts mean in law.

References

American Academy of Forensic Sciences Standards Board. (2018). Forensic anthropology in disaster victim identification: Best practice recommendations for the medicolegal authority (ANSI/ASB Best Practice Recommendation 010).

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).

INTERPOL. (2023). Disaster victim identification guide (2023 edition). International Criminal Police Organization.

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). OSAC 2021-N-0010 standard for skeletal preparation and sampling in forensic anthropology. U.S. Department of Commerce.

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2021). ANSI/ASB Standard 150-21: Standard for determination of medicolegal significance from skeletal remains in forensic anthropology. U.S. Department of Commerce.

Passalacqua, N. V., Bartelink, E. J., McQuade, W., Steadman, D. W., Boyd, D., Spradley, K., Sauerwein, K., & Ho, R. (2025). The development of standards for the ethical use of human skeletal remains for education, research, and training in forensic anthropology. National Institute of Standards and Technology.

United States Department of Justice, Office of Legal Policy. (2023). Uniform language for testimony and reports: Forensic anthropology discipline.

Christensen, A. M. (2009). Evidentiary standards for forensic anthropology. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 54(6), 1235–1240. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2009.01176.x

Blau, S., & Briggs, C. A. (2011). The role of forensic anthropology in disaster victim identification (DVI). Forensic Science, Medicine, and Pathology, 7, 114–119.

Cattaneo, C. (2007). Forensic anthropology: Developments of a classical discipline in the new millennium. Forensic Science International, 165(2–3), 185–193.